



Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume II, No. 7

May 4, 1942

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Unity of History

THE fabric of history is woven upon one loom. The theory which makes absolute distinctions between war and peace is false. War is an overt expression of covert tensions and conflicts which exist in every stable and peaceful social situation. In war things that have been hidden become revealed, though the conflict between competing individuals and collective wills is not as hidden as the superficial observer imagines. This fact makes nonsense of theories which give an absolute moral preference to peace over war. On the other hand war may be a school in cooperation. Individuals and nations may learn lessons for the day of peace in times of war.

The quality of the peace which we hope to enjoy after this war, is being determined to a large degree while the battle is still raging. That is why it is fatuous for the "good" people to disavow responsibility for the war and content themselves with drawing blueprints for the peace. The peace will not be made in a vacuum. The new chapter in world history, which must be written if our civilization is not to perish, can not be written without reference to the old chapter which is being written now, in blood and tears. The two chapters will be intimately related to each other.

There are problems of domestic justice which will be solved by the war emergency more than by the peace after the war. The necessities of the emergency require some restrictions upon liberties. If a society is not healthy the emergency is used to infringe upon essential liberties and democracy is lost. If a society is robust the essential liberties are stubbornly maintained against all perils and democracy emerges with greater self-respect, for having maintained itself in a crisis. The problem of equal justice is even more urgent in times of war than the problem of liberty. Every pressure group in a society is tempted to use a war emergency to enlarge its powers and privileges. On the other hand, if a society has any residual health of democratic justice, it will seek to improve its morale by achieving a more genuine justice in the war period. No one can deny that Britain has moved to-

ward a more equal justice in all its social relationships under the pressure of war needs. There are possibilities that we will do the same. Every taxation law passed during wartime, and every law regulating the relations of capital and labor, is a tremendous undertaking in which much can be lost and much can be gained in the direction of a more just social order.

All the gains, which may be achieved in wartime, are not necessarily maintained in peacetime. But many gains can be achieved in wartime which would not be possible in peacetime at all. It is also possible that a society may be so lacking in democratic health, that a war emergency accentuates its injustices, as was the case in France. But in that case the war merely hastened processes of decay, which were previously apparent, and which would have revealed themselves more clearly subsequently, if there had been no war.

It is possible to achieve new advances in international as well as in domestic relations in times of conflict. It may be that India will gain its freedom under the whip of necessity, much more quickly than would have been the case in times of peace. But at this point it is important to emphasize the unity of history once more. Had the groundwork for a free India not been laid in the life of both India and Britain before the war, the necessities of the conflict would merely have produced increased coercion in the old imperialism. One might wish that our own Negroes had as strategic a position as the people of India have, in which case they could press advantages from the war emergency which are likely to be denied them under present circumstances. Yet it is possible that they will make some real gains during this period.

We do not suggest that all this can be done without appeals to the conscience of men. The moral factor is always at work. But the trials and tribulations of history are sometimes better schoolmasters than any amount of moral precept.

The unity of history is particularly obvious in the problem of creating a world community in which nations will have a sense of mutual responsibility toward each other and will be ready to implement such a sense

of mutual obligation in definite constitutional commitments. Those commitments are being forged even now in the many councils, diplomatic and military, in which the United Nations are seeking to achieve unity of purpose and strategy. The shape of the post-war world is being determined by this war experience of the nations to a very large degree. This is where the nations are learning that they must bear each others' burdens. This is where they are testing in bitter experience how potential conflict must be avoided by mutual accommodation. Here too, the united police force, which must some day stand behind any new constitutional arrangements, is being recruited and organized.

All the problems for post-war reconstruction are not being solved now. Some very desperate ones will remain. But there is not a single problem of world-reconstruction for which there is not some relevant

wartime experience. We are living in a tragic world, without a doubt. But it is not a world from which God has fled or from which he averts His eyes, until the scene corresponds a little more to His goodness. His chastisements are obvious enough in the sorrows and sufferings through which we are passing. But so are His calls to repentance and the opportunities to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. Days of catastrophe are days of the Lord. There are some who regard themselves especially called, beyond their fellow Christians, who are really in the position of the foolish virgins. They have no oil for their lamps when the bridegroom cometh. They did not expect him in darkness. They expected him in light. Yet it is predicted that the "sign of the Son of man" shall appear when "the sun be darkened and the moon shall not give her light."

R. N.

India In Apocalypse

WILLIAM PATON

A VISITOR to America, especially if he be British, cannot fail to note the widespread and profound concern felt in all parts of the United States about India. Probably interest in the recent negotiations has been as keen in the United States as anywhere in the world, with the exception of India and Great Britain themselves, and it is doubtful whether the British press, hampered by paper shortage, has devoted as much space to the Cripps mission as the great American papers. There is, accordingly, a great disappointment at the failure of Sir Stafford's mission and the seriousness of that failure ought not to be minimized. At the same time it is possible to hold that the series of events which culminated on April 11th has done good in the sense that it has demonstrated with tragic clearness the fundamental nature of the Indian problem. It should not henceforth be possible to treat it as quite so simple and quite so easily solved as much current writing would suggest.

Briefly, the proposals made by the British War Cabinet have been turned down by the two major Indian negotiating bodies, the All-India National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, for contradictory reasons. The Congress insists that the proposals do not give independence now, and by independence they mean, apparently, that complete and absolute control of government should be handed over to an All-India body representative of all sections of

the country on some kind of democratic system. They further claim that the people of the Indian states ruled by the Princes are treated simply as "commodities," inasmuch as their destiny under the proposed scheme would be settled by the Princes for them. They further claim complete control of the defense of India. They insist that the proposals would lead to the fragmentation of India inasmuch as they leave open the possibility that provinces predominantly Muslim might choose to stand out of the Indian Union. On this point the Congress is slightly evasive, for it says that it cannot "think in terms of compelling the people of any territorial unit to remain in an Indian Union against their declared and established will." They hold that the Cabinet proposals go further than this. Further, they evince so radical a distrust of Great Britain as to make any promises, no matter how definite, valueless.

The All-India Muslim League turns down the proposals because, although the possibility of a separate Muslim India is recognized, there is no clear provision for the Muslims of India as a whole to be consulted and their will accepted. The provincial areas which would be invited to decide for adherence to the Indian Union or secession from it contain large numbers of non-Muslims and "the procedure laid down is for reference to be made to the whole adult population of the province and not to Muslims alone,

which is to deny the inherent right of self-determination." The Muslim answer also stresses the point that the Cabinet proposals had to be taken as they were without alteration, and that no clear indication was given of the nature of the temporary All-India government pending the bringing into force of the proposals for an Indian Union.

Sir Stafford Cripps, in his press statement and in his moving and powerful broadcast, points out that neither party faces the fact that the two essentials set forth at different times in the last two years by Indian parties as essential to a solution of the problem are both granted. The first is the promise of effective independence; the second, of a constituent assembly which should draft an Indian constitution. Sir Stafford, whose broadcast was singularly free of any phrases which might further exacerbate public opinion, could not refrain from remarking on a "critical and unconstructive attitude natural enough in the law courts and the market place." He further points out that the claim in the crisis of the war that India should have complete control of Indian defense is utterly impracticable. He urges, finally, that the claim for absolute independence *now* can only mean a claim on the part of the Congress, without any solution of electoral or communal questions, to be placed in a position of despotic control of India—a course which could only lead to bitter opposition from minorities.

These are the essential elements in the breakdown. Let us now consider some of the facts which lie behind.

Facts Behind Struggle Within India

The Congress and the Muslim leaders stand for principles which are radically contradictory, and this is the heart of the problem in so far as it is an Indian problem. The All-India National Congress is much the most important and powerful political institution in India. It numbers within its ranks most of the Indian Nationalists who have become famous to the outside world, and it clings to the conception of the democratic process and the majority vote, practised in America and Britain and other democratic countries, as the basis of an Indian democracy. It regards the population of the Indian states as the victims of despotic tyranny on the part of the Princes, and desires to extend the range of its influence over them. It denies, and truly, that it is a purely Hindu organization, pointing out that those who wish to see a purely Hindu political organization at work can turn their attention to the Mahasabha. It has a number of Muslim members and its president is a Muslim Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. At the same time the vast majority of its members are Hindu. Accurate information of its membership is not available but it is understood that its total membership has decreased in

recent years from four and one half million to less than two million.

The All-India Muslim League looks at the problem from an entirely different angle. It contemplates the fact that Muslims number ninety millions out of the total three hundred and eighty-eight millions of India, and it is convinced that in any all-India democratic system Muslims must be in a permanent minority. It is so convinced of the predominantly Hindu character of the Congress that it does not believe that under any such general democratic system the Muslim would get a fair deal. It has, therefore, put forward the conception of "Pakistan," or a Muslim India, comprising the provinces in which Muslims are a majority—the northwest-frontier province, Sind, the Punjab, Bengal, and perhaps some other areas. It is possible that the "Pakistan" scheme in its purity was never meant to be more than a bargaining counter, but there can be no doubt that the Muslim League is determined to oppose any all-India democratic scheme for the reasons above mentioned. The case against any such a scheme is obvious. Not only does it break up the unity of India, which is one of the major fruits of the period of the British government, but it condemns large non-Muslim minorities (45% in the Punjab and Bengal) to precisely the same permanent minority state as the Muslims fear for themselves in India as a whole.

The Princes are in a different position. They are not subjects of the British Crown but are bound by treaty to it. They are sovereign over their own populations, subject to the presence of advisers to the Viceroy who in case of serious misgovernment intervene. Their foreign relationships they have ceded to the Viceroy. Accordingly, they are mainly concerned in all these negotiations with preserving as much as possible of their political rights and privileges, though there is a growing feeling among them that they will do well to make terms with the rising forces of democracy in India.

The Hindu Mahasabha is the Hindu religion in politics. It is a strongly anti-Muslim body, hostile to the Congress as insufficiently Hindu in policy, but mainly concerned with fighting Muslim aggression. It is, therefore, very strongly opposed to "Pakistan" and to the proposals of the British War Cabinet, which allowed predominantly Muslim provinces to decide whether to join the Union or not.

The Sikhs, who live mainly in the Punjab, are equally afraid of Muslim overlordship, recognizing that if the Punjab did decide not to adhere to the India Union they would be left as a small minority, though with a strong martial tradition, at the mercy of the Muslim majority. The depressed classes, whose representative so far as they have any is Dr. Ambedkar, may be counted as the whole anti-Congress. Mr. Gandhi has done a great deal to draw

public attention in India to the iniquity of untouchability, but Dr. Ambedkar and his friends regard the Congress as hopelessly Hindu and have no faith in any justice being given to the Untouchables by any government which is predominantly congress Hindu in complexion.

The Indian Christians, who, although nearly ten millions in number, count for relatively little in the political struggle, have in recent years given a good lesson to the other communities. They have never sought for special privileges. They have stood against the principle of separate electorates and they have bravely stood for all-India nationalism, trusting themselves to the goodwill of their fellow-countrymen. It should, however, be added that they have been critical of the Congress governments from 1937-39 on the ground of certain invasions of the rights of Christians.

Distrust of Great Britain

It will be evident from what has been said above that the problem of Indian agreement is one of the utmost complexity. It boils down to the issue between an all-India democracy and the fears of the minority communities. There is, however, another side of the whole question which it is important to remember and not least important for those who, like the writer of this article, are British. There is a profound distrust of British promises in India. My own belief is that this is ill based, and that the steady progress through the last twenty or thirty years of constitutional reform has shown the basic determination of the British democracy to secure real self-government in India. The fact, however, remains that great numbers of Indians do not think so, and it is for this reason that British leaders have come to realize that no mere promises of the conferment of Dominion status so soon as Indians might agree can any longer avail. It was hoped that the action taken in July, 1941, when the Viceroy's Council for the first time in history came to contain a majority of non-official Indians, might be taken as a significant act more important than any promise. Apparently, however, this was not so. It is difficult, however, to escape the conviction that the scheme put forward by Sir Stafford Cripps (whose personal record in these matters is of the highest importance and relevance) did represent so clear and unambiguous a statement of policy as to be free from this kind of suspicion.

I would add another consideration. The very vigor and difficulty of the intercommunal struggle in India shows that Indians do in truth believe, whatever they may say, that real power is to be transferred. It is one of the plain lessons of recent years in India that intercommunal rivalry (I am not thinking of riots but of struggle for political power) has steadily risen just in proportion to the growing nearness of the

prospect of a real transfer of power. People do not fight as hard as the Muslims, the Hindu Mahasabha, and the Congress unless they believe that real power is within reach. All this should be remembered by those who are inclined to doubt whether there is any intention on the British side to relinquish the reality of power. Nevertheless, it is important for the British people to take to heart the depth of distrust which exists in Indian political circles, and it is plainly necessary that though these particular proposals have failed, action should still be taken as far as possible in the spirit of them.

Future for India

Is it now possible to consider what the future is likely to bring? I should be inclined to dismiss the problem of the Princes as not being of the first importance. It is not possible for the British Government to break its treaties with them by unilateral action, but the sweep of Indian events is likely to have its own effect upon them. Already very definite and grave advice has been offered to them by the present Viceroy and it seems unlikely that they will be a permanent barrier in the way of Indian democracy, unless a state of chaos reigned, in which case they might be tempted to enlarge their dominions.

The real issue is that between all-India democracy and the communal fears. All who love India must desire that she should be united. Different as Indians are from one another—Punjab from Madras, Brahmin from Untouchable—nobody can be in any doubt that an Indian is an Indian and that he is different from an Arab on the one hand or a Mongol on the other. Let it not be forgotten either that never until the British power extended over India was the whole of India brought into a single political organization. It is, therefore, a common point between Indian Nationalists and the British that there should be an All India if an All India is possible. British law and the English language are two other gifts to India which make for unity. Personal law is still Hindu or Muslim or other, but criminal and civil law are English. The English language is the only language other than their own which is spoken by educated Indians in all parts of the Indian Empire. It cannot, therefore, be desired by any lover of India that the future should hold for India only a Balkanization on a vast scale.

What is the way out? Only, it would seem, a growing realization in India on the part of the great minorities that they have nothing to fear from an All India system of government. We had hoped that the imminence of war in India and the world-wide pressure on India for settlement, typified by the visit of General Chiang Kai-Shek and the visit of Mr. Louis Johnson would bring about agreement. This scheme has failed, but there is no way out except that

the continued pressure of world opinion should convince the Indian groups that their fears are illusory and that a settlement would have such a welcome at the hands of world opinion that minorities would be in a strong position.

For us in Britain there is a plain duty not to allow disappointment or pique to interfere with the steady pressing forward of the only possible policy, which

is to give the reality of power and complete self-government to India so soon as that can be done without creating greater dissension and disturbing world order. It is true that the uncertainty of the attitude of the Muslim populations of the Near East may lend further strength to Muslim intransigence but against that must be put the obvious desire of the civilized peoples that India should be united and free.

The Importance of the Chaplaincy

LT. C. LESLIE GLENN

BEING a preacher, my only contact with other preachers' sermons is in Monday morning's paper, but allowing for some poor reporting, I think it is safe to say that from time to time preachers have as their subject, "The Importance of Church-going." On many Mondays I have an impression that men were urged the day before to go to Church.

Very well, is it not equally necessary for the Church to go to men? If it is really so desperately important for every soul to seek the church (and I agree with these preachers) how can there be the slightest question about the importance of the church seeking the souls? And by seeking, I don't mean opening a building, hiring a choir and hoping that people will be drawn to the preaching. Seeking means going where they are, and they aren't living in our cities and towns these days. They are in armies and on ships and stations.

These men whom we asked to give up their golf so we could talk to them in church, are asking us to give up our churches so we can talk to them in the Army and Navy. And if the matter was pressing enough to demand a sacrifice of their time in civilian life, it is pressing enough to demand a sacrifice of our time in military life.

That is the first reason why the chaplaincies are important. There are millions of men under arms. The church must be there. If a chaplain had no opportunities in the armed forces whatsoever, if he were busy all day handing out mail, and cataloguing the library and refereeing prize fights, nevertheless, as a gesture, he must be on hand. The chaplain is much more than a figurehead as I shall attempt to show, but if he were only a symbol, that, by itself, would be enough.

There was an editorial in a church paper the other day urging us to put first things first. "It isn't enough to be engaged in Red Cross work, and Air Raid Lessons, we must not forget our first duty—our Parish Work!" It's too bad about the Parish Work in the Philippine Islands.

I read the most impassioned pleas from able Rectors in their parish leaflets, urging the Parishioners not to forget the boys who have gone out from the Parish. "Write them a letter, send them a package of cigarettes, send them a whole carton, etc." Perhaps Studdert-Kennedy's lines could be printed in Parish Leaflets. He was called "Woodbine Willie" because he gave out Woodbine cigarettes to the troops for which he was Chaplain in the last war. And he wrote some place about "Woodbine Willie."

They gave me this name like their nature,
Compacted of laughter and tears,
A sweet that was born of the bitter,
A joke that was torn from the years.

Their name! Let me hear it—the symbol
Of unpaid—unpayable debt,
For the men to whom I owed God's Peace,
I put off with a cigarette.

But at least these cigarettes were given out personally in the front-line trenches.

Let me say one more bitter thing and then I'm done. A Minister of deserved prominence was explaining to me in the most casual manner, the real reason why clergy of his denomination were not filling their quota in the chaplain's corps. "They are not sure they will get churches after the war. Furthermore, this is the time to get a good church when some others are going off to war." God forgive us, it may be true, but it is the kind of thing that should be said with a blush. If lawyers go to war, do they get their practice back? They do not. Do architects keep their practice? They do not. Do doctors keep their patients? They do not. And are not we clergy the ones who urge upon the rest of humanity the necessity of sacrifice?

Sacrifice for democracy, which is an easy phrase in any pulpit these days, consists of a series of inconveniences like living uncomfortably, being unsure of the future, being separated from one's home. And it

is this very sacrifice which clergy in large numbers have not so far been willing to make. Both the chaplain's corps of the Army and Navy have had pretty slim picking because not enough of our first-rate men have offered themselves.

There are some good reasons for this. Some clergymen feel that if war is wrong, so is serving in the armed forces in any capacity whatsoever. If all the young men in your Parish were going to a lynching you would not go along, just to keep the church with them, unless you went to dissuade them. And that last would not be permitted in the Services.

Some clergymen stand aloof from the war because they are not alarmed about the situation. They feel that the war may not last long, or they cannot imagine how many men are involved. While this is a more worthy reason than fear of discomfort, it is an indictment of those who set themselves up as leaders of the people. Those who should be the first to discern the signs of the times, seem to be the last. If "too little and too late" is the reproach of democracy, the church must bear most of the blame, for it presumes to lead the people, and the general attitude of vast numbers of the clergy has been "too little and too late."

One hears another thing in pulpits which can hardly be taken as a true expression of opinion. It must be carelessness in sentence structure or paragraph arrangement. Some preachers seem to be saying in effect that the church must not get "involved" in the war, we must not "bless" this war, nor on the other hand are we pacifists. We repudiate conscientious objectors as extremists, but at the same time, refuse to allow our churches "to become recruiting stations." We are glad to organize dances for sailors but hope they won't expect to hear on Sunday any reasons for fighting. Their uniform is as great an embarrassment as the ministry candidate who left our Parish for a C.O. Work Camp. This type of preaching seems to be saying, "You fight your nasty war and we'll tell you how to make the peace. When this madness that has afflicted mankind is over, then the church can do its parochial work again."

How can the Christian Church occupy this middle ground? Are Christians by definition, indifferent fighters? In order not "to glorify war" are they supposed to fight surreptitiously?

That is the second reason for the importance of the chaplaincy. To show by our presence that the church believes in the thing the soldiers are fighting for. Men respect the church, even if they don't belong, and they get great courage when they feel that the Church approves their conduct with more than words.

Incidentally, when a prominent clergyman was reputed in the papers to have resigned his pulpit rather than bless the war, one Ensign observed, "Who asked him to bless this war? I wouldn't fight in it if he

blessed it." If, as a Christian layman, I should be willing to operate a machine gun in this war, as a Christian minister I have the express obligation of encouraging the machine gunner to shoot faster, that is unless one has some theory of Orders that holds a different code for laity and clergy. Unless one repudiates the universal priesthood of all believers.

So there must be ministers of religion with the armed forces. They will be sharing the life of over five million of our finest men. One of our Jewish Chaplains has pointed out what he calls the most embarrassing text in the Old Testament, Exodus 2:11. "When Moses was grown he went out unto his brethren, and *looked* on their burdens." He says that generations of Rabbis have tried to embellish this word "look" by legends telling how Moses bore some of the burdens himself long before he killed the taskmaster. The great liberator was never simply an observer.

Every minister may not go to war any more than every doctor, but the importance of going should be more generally recognized, and the Chaplain's Corps should have the same representation of our best men as has the Medical Corps.

The job of Chaplain, however, is far from being a symbol. In this war, the Army and Navy have done everything that any minister could ask for to give him an opportunity to do his work. Chapels have been provided in all the camps, funds are available in both services for equipment and as far as the physical arrangements are concerned, the Chaplain has everything he needs.

The Chaplain is released from duties formerly connected with his office of serving as athletic director, librarian, entertainment officer, postmaster, etc. He may enter into these activities as much as he likes and is anxious to help with everything that adds to the general morale of his men. All non-military activities are his field, all the human side of Army and Navy life is his interest. He stands ready to be called on wherever he is needed, naturally, just as any clergyman does in civilian life. But in the modern Army and Navy, the primary interest and duty of the clergyman is recognized and he is free for spiritual tasks. I venture to think that he is more free from organizational detail in the Army in wartime than he is in ordinary Parish life. What Parish Priest wouldn't jump at the chance to have his daily task confined to preaching and pastoral work!

He conducts public worship. If the men want to go to anyone for leadership in worship, they have to go to him. There is usually no choice. He is apt to be the sole representative of God in the situation. That in itself is a fearful responsibility which underlines the importance of the task.

The Chaplain happily has an opportunity in the problem of denominationalism to work out an impor-

tant solution. He is chaplain of all, regardless of creed or lack of it. In his bearing he must avoid two extremes. He must not pretend that all faiths are the same and he is the minister of a revelation that is superior to that of any present-day church, nor on the other hand, must he allow his own firm conviction to lead him into petty tyranny over others. If he is on to his job, he neither waters down his message, nor does he seek a monopoly.

So he will quietly carry on his own practices for men of his own denomination and any others who care to come, and he will see to it that every other denomination has an opportunity to worship in its way as far as possible, and he will thirdly so conduct the general services for all that all will feel at home.

One of the dangers of being a chaplain, is that you are never alone. There is not much privacy in military life, and it is difficult to make opportunities to read. On the other hand, it means that there is no snare of preparation. We are not forever getting ready to do something some day for which we are preparing ourselves. In the Services, the opportunity is now and if we fall behind in our reading it is probably unimportant for these few years when men are demanding all our time.

The World Church: News and Notes

Christian Basis of Swiss Gothard League

The Gothard League, a new movement which is seeking to renew Swiss national life and which is attracting much attention, owes its existence to some men anxious to provide the Swiss people with a focussing-point for all men of good will, apart from partisan rivalries. It has just published a carefully-framed "National Charter" which has stimulated a lively discussion in the press and among the public. We quote from it some passages which show the Christian ideas which inspire it.

"The sense of freedom and community is rooted in the Christian faith. It is that faith which is opposed to egoism and the spirit of domination, and inspires the sacrifice and mutual help of which our national community constantly has need. The Christian spirit develops respect for human personality, for the diversity of created beings and their varied vocations. It recognizes the ordering power of the community.

"The vocation of man is to be a servant of God, master of things, and brother of his neighbor. As a servant of God, he belongs to an order superior to the human order; the State does not have the right to interfere in this domain. As a master of things, the creative spirit of man masters matter and bends it to his laws. As a brother of his neighbor, he has his own place and responsibilities in the community of others like himself. This responsibility towards others is the basis of community. . . .

A military outfit or a ship is a very closely knit unit, and everyone is thrown into personal contact with the chaplain if he simply walks around. For some men this is the first time they have ever got that close to a preacher, and curiosity or even antagonism are good openings. The chaplain is under a magnifying glass, he bears an intimate relationship to everyone on board, which is found in civilian life only in those parishes where the clergyman has been in one Parish for many years. The tempo of the emergency intensifies every contact so that the work of years in the ordinary parish seems telescoped into months. Of course, in actual combat this is even more obvious. Every minister wants the church to be with them when they have to move into danger.

The thing all of us care most about is the peace that follows this war. The men who are fighting the war are going to have as large a share in the peace as any other group. If they know what they are fighting for, if their attitude toward reconstruction is a good one, the battle may not have been in vain. Who can measure therefore, the possible influence of the chaplains as leaders of this group? The chaplain can be the Servant of the Servants of the Future.

"A real community does not tolerate the humiliation or the placing in an inferior position of a whole category of men; it also rejects an abstract qualitarianism which brings with it the rule of mediocrity. Each person finds his own place and his mission in it."

Catholic Week of Christian Unity

The Roman Catholic organizers of the Week of Christian Unity (January 18 to 25) published a Call to Prayer from which we quote these extracts:

"... *Let us pray!* That the Holy Spirit may grant the Holy Father divine light and strength, so that he may awaken or stimulate among all the Christians entrusted to him, Catholic and non-Catholic, the acute suffering of separation, a real penitence and amendment, an ardent and peace-making prayer.

"... For the lack of significance we have attached to this word from Thy divine heart: 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice . . .': We beseech Thee to forgive us, O Lord.

"For our unfortunate tendency to look at the mote which we see in the eye of our non-Catholic Christian brethren, rather than at their good faith and good will: We beseech Thee to forgive us, O Lord.

"For our controversies, sometimes filled with irony, narrowness of mind, or exaggerations in relation to them; for our intransigencies and our severe judgments:

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| JOHN C. BENNETT | RHODA E. McCULLOCH |
| CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM | FRANCIS P. MILLER |
| F. ERNEST JOHNSON | EDWARD L. PARSONS |
| HENRY SMITH LEIPER | HOWARD C. ROBBINS |
| JOHN A. MACKAY | HENRY P. VAN DUSEN |
| HELEN LANE ROBERTS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i> | |

We beseech Thee to forgive us, O Lord.

"For the bad examples of our conduct, which have retarded, diminished, or destroyed the effect of grace in their souls: We beseech Thee to forgive us, O Lord.

"For our forgetting to make frequent, fervent, brotherly prayer for them: We beseech Thee to forgive us, O Lord.

"In spite of linguistic, racial, national frontiers: Unite us, Jesus.

"In spite of our ignorances, our prejudices, our enmities: Unite us, Jesus. . . .

"O God, for Thy greater glory: Gather together the scattered Christians. . . .

"O God, to confound the pride of Satan and his agents: Gather together the scattered Christians. . . ."

British Presbyterians Champion Jews

At a conference of representatives of the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, held in Edinburgh at the end of January, it was voted that the conference "deplores any denial to persons of Jewish descent of the right of equal treatment before the law, and urges that the governments take immediate steps (after the war) to restore to the full status of human dignity such Jewish people as have been deprived of it, and in particular that all legislation unjustly diminishing the rights of Jews as such shall be repealed at an early date. . . . The conference urges on all governments the recognition of the unfettered right of every individual to a free choice of religious faith and to the public profession and preaching of it, so long as these faiths do not run counter to public law and order. The conference urges His Majesty's government, in conjunction with other allies and friendly nations, to provide for some scheme of emigration for Jews who cannot find a home in Europe."

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Avas.
Detroit, Mich.

Russian Evangelicals Speak to Britain

The *Baptist Times* of Great Britain reports that Dr. Rushbrooke, president of the Baptist World Alliance, has received a communication from the Soviet Union "Council of Evangelical Christians" in which the Russian Christians hail "the historic agreement between the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain." They declare, "We Russian Christians consider Great Britain the citadel of living Christianity. We believe that the alliance concluded by our governments will also serve to further closer co-operation between the Christians of both nations." The letter concludes, "May Christ be near us in the days of the great trials which have fallen on our countries. May He bless our governments and our peoples."

Hungarian Primate Opposes Anti-Semitism

A bill extending restrictive measures against Jews which had passed the lower house of the Hungarian parliament was defeated in the upper house through the intervention of Cardinal Serebi, Primate of the Hungarian Catholic Church.

YMCA and War Prisoners

It is reported that the World's Committee of the YMCA is employing thirty-nine secretaries for work among prisoners of war. Ten secretaries are working in Germany. Three secretaries are working in occupied France. In Britain and Switzerland a varied activity for prisoners has developed. Negotiations with the Italian government to allow work for prisoners have not yet been fruitful.

Nazis Object to Dutch Sermons

The Dutch Nazi paper, *Volk en Vaderland*, complains that ministers of religion preach too much "Jerusalem sob stuff" speaking to their congregations of "threatening dangers" and of "heavy trials to be faced" and of the "great sorrow of our hearts." The paper declares that since these trials and sorrows are never quite defined, the congregations are left to draw their own conclusions.

Authors in This Issue

The Reverend William Paton, D.D., was for five years General Secretary of the National Christian Council for India, Burma and Ceylon. He is at present Joint General Secretary of the World Council of Churches and of the International Missionary Council.

The Reverend C. Leslie Glenn is rector of St. John's Church in Washington. At present he is on leave of absence from his church and is acting as chaplain in the United States Naval Reserve Midshipmen's School in New York City.

We wish to express our deep appreciation to those of our readers who replied so promptly and kindly to our request for the names of friends who might be interested in our journal. We have written to those whose names were received and would welcome at any time further suggestions for possible subscribers.

650